

# EXHIBIT 2

GUIDO SAVERI (22349)  
guido@saveri.com  
R. ALEXANDER SAVERI (173102)  
rick@saveri.com  
GEOFFREY C. RUSHING (126910)  
grushing@saveri.com  
CADIO ZIRPOLI (179108)  
cadio@saveri.com  
GIANNA GRUENWALD (228969)  
gianna@saveri.com  
SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.  
706 Sansome Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 217-6810  
Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

*Interim Lead Counsel for the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs*  
[Additional Attorneys Appear on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 3:07-cv-5944 SC

MDL No. 1917

**CLASS ACTION**

This Document Relates to:  
Direct Purchaser Actions

**DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS'  
CONSOLIDATED AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

The Honorable Samuel Conti

1	<b><u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u></b>	
2	I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
3	II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE.....	2
4	III. PARTIES	
5	A. Plaintiffs .....	3
6	B. Defendants .....	5
7	IV. AGENTS AND CO-CONSPIRATORS .....	19
8	V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS.....	19
9	VI. TRADE AND COMMERCE.....	21
10	VII. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS .....	21
11	A. CRT Technology and Products .....	21
12	B. Oligopolistic Nature of the CRT Industry .....	24
13	C. International Antitrust Investigations .....	26
14	D. Collusive Contacts, Meetings, And Agreements Among Members of the CRT Products Industry.....	30
15	E. Summary of Specific Defendant Participation In Unlawful Meetings And Agreements.....	34
17	F. Use of Trade Associations And Trade Events To Facilitate The Conspiracy.....	39
18	G. Effects of Defendants' Antitrust Violations.....	40
19	1. Examples of Reductions in Manufacturing Capacity by Defendants .....	40
20	2. Examples of Collusive Pricing for CRT Products .....	41
21	H. Summary Of Effects Of The Conspiracy Involving CRT Products.....	43
22	I. Fraudulent Concealment .....	43
23	VIII. CLAIM FOR VIOLATIONS OF 15 U.S.C. § 1 .....	45
24	IX. DAMAGES .....	47
25	X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	47
26	XI. JURY TRIAL DEMANDED .....	48

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves individually and on behalf of a Plaintiff class (the “Class”) consisting of all persons and entities who directly purchased a Cathode Ray Tube Product, as defined below, in the United States from any Defendant or any subsidiary or affiliate thereof between March 1, 1995 and November 25, 2007 (the “Class Period”). Defendants are among the leading manufacturers of: (a) color picture tubes (“CPTs”), which are cathode ray tubes (“CRTs”) used primarily in color televisions; (b) color display tubes (“CDTs”), which are CRTs used primarily in color computer monitors; and (c) electronic devices containing CPTs (such as televisions) or CDTs (such as computer monitors). For the purposes of this Consolidated Amended Complaint, CPTs of all sizes and the products containing them shall be referred to collectively as “CPT Products.” Also for the purposes of this Consolidated Amended Complaint, CDTs of all sizes and the products containing them shall be referred to as “CDT Products.” CDT Products and CPT Products shall be referred to collectively herein as “CRT Products.”

2. Defendants control the majority of the CRT industry, a multibillion dollar market, which in 1999 alone generated over \$19 billion dollars in gross revenue. During the Class Period, virtually every household in the United States owned at least one CRT Product.

3. Since the mid-1990's, the CRT industry faced significant economic pressures as customer preferences for other emerging technologies shrank profits and threatened the sustainability of the industry. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that in order to maintain price stability, increase profitability, and decrease the erosion of pricing in the CRT market, Defendants conspired, combined and contracted to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price at which CRT Products were sold in the United States.

4. As part of and in furtherance of this conspiracy, Defendants or their agents engaged in various collusive practices with respect to CRT Products.

5. With respect to CRT Products, Defendants or their agents agreed, *inter alia*, to: (a) fix target prices and price guidelines; (b) exchange pertinent information on, *inter alia*, shipments, prices, production, and customer demand; (c) coordinate public statements regarding available capacity and supply; (d) resolve issues created by asymmetrical vertical integration among some

1 of the co-conspirators; (e) keep their collusive meetings secret; (f) expose cheating on the  
2 agreements and to discuss the reconciliation of accounts; (g) allocate market share of overall sales;  
3 (g) influence and, at times, coordinate pricing with producers in other geographic areas; (h) limit  
4 competition for certain key customers; (i) allocate customers; (j) allocate each producer's share of  
5 certain key customers' sales; and (k) restrict output.

6 6. The conspiracy concerning CRT Products commenced with bilateral meetings that  
7 began in at least March of 1995 and continued throughout the Class Period. Also beginning in  
8 1995, the co-conspirators began to engage in informal group meetings. By 1997, these group  
9 meetings had become more formalized, as described in greater detail below. There were at least  
10 500 meetings during the Class Period, including hundreds of group meetings and hundreds of  
11 bilateral meetings. These meetings occurred in various locales, including Taiwan, South Korea,  
12 Indonesia, Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia, China, the U.K. and Europe. These meetings included  
13 representatives from the highest levels of the respective companies, as well as regional managers  
14 and others.

15 7. This conspiracy is being investigated by the United States Department of Justice  
16 ("DOJ") and by multiple foreign competition authorities. The first participant to be indicted by the  
17 DOJ was C.Y. Lin, the former Chairman and CEO of Defendant Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd.,  
18 who had a two-count indictment issued against him by a federal grand jury in San Francisco on  
19 February 10, 2009.

## 20 II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

21 8. Plaintiffs bring this action to obtain injunctive relief and to recover damages,  
22 including treble damages, costs of suit, and reasonable attorneys' fees arising from Defendants'  
23 violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 1).

24 9. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337(a)  
25 and 1367.

26 10. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §§ 15 and 22, and 28  
27 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c), in that at least one of the Defendants resides in this judicial district, is  
28 licensed to do business or is doing business in this judicial district.

### III. PARTIES

#### A. Plaintiffs

11. Plaintiff Crago, d/b/a Dash Computers, Inc., is a Kansas corporation with its principal place of business in Merriam, Kansas. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff purchased one or more CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

12. Plaintiff Arch Electronics, Inc., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and has its principal place of business in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff purchased one or more CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

13. Plaintiff Electronic Design Company, is a corporation with its principle place of business in Shoreview, Minnesota. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff purchased one or more CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

14. Plaintiff Hawel A. Hawel, d/b/a City Electronics, is a California business with its principal place of business in Modesto, California. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff purchased one or more CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

15. Plaintiff Meijer, Inc. and Meijer Distribution, Inc., are Michigan corporations with their principal place of business in Grand Rapids, Michigan. During the Class Period, these Plaintiffs purchased one or more CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

16. Plaintiff Nathan Muchnick, Inc., was a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and had its principal place of business in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff purchased one or more CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

1           17. Plaintiff Orion Home Systems, LLC, is a Minnesota limited liability corporation  
2 with its principal place of business in Eagan, Minnesota. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff  
3 purchased one or more CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries  
4 and suffered injury as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

5           18. Plaintiff Paula Call d/b/a Poway-Rancho Bernardo TV, is a California business  
6 with its principal place of business in San Diego, California. During the Class Period, this  
7 Plaintiff purchased one or more CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their  
8 subsidiaries and suffered injury as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

9           19. Plaintiff Princeton Display Technologies, Inc., is a New Jersey corporation with its  
10 principal place of business in Princeton, New Jersey. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff  
11 purchased one or more CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries  
12 and suffered injury as a result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

13           20. Plaintiff Radio & TV Equipment, Inc., is a business headquartered in Fargo, North  
14 Dakota. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff purchased one or more CRT Products directly from  
15 one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a result of defendants'  
16 unlawful conduct.

17           21. Plaintiff Royal Data Services, Inc., is a Hawaii corporation with its principal place  
18 of business in Honolulu, Hawaii. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff purchased one or more  
19 CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a  
20 result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

21           22. Plaintiff Studio Spectrum, Inc., is a California business with its principal place of  
22 business in Burbank, California. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff purchased one or more  
23 CRT Products directly from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a  
24 result of defendants' unlawful conduct.

25           23. Plaintiff Wettstein and Sons, Inc., d/b/a Wettstein's is a corporation organized and  
26 existing under the laws of the State of Wisconsin with its principal place of business in La Crosse,  
27 Wisconsin. During the Class Period, this Plaintiff purchased one or more CRT Products directly  
28 from one of the defendants and/or their subsidiaries and suffered injury as a result of defendants'



1 unlawful conduct.

2 **B. Defendants**

3 **Chunghwa Entities**

4 24. Defendant Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd. ("Chunghwa PT") is a Taiwanese  
5 company with its principal place of business at No. 1127, Heping Rd., Bade City, Taoyuan,  
6 Taiwan. It was established in 1971 by Tatung Corporation to manufacture CRTs. In 1974,  
7 Chunghwa PT's CRTs received certification by the United States, giving the company entry into  
8 that market. Throughout the Class Period, Chunghwa PT was one of the major global CRT  
9 manufacturers. During the Class Period, Chunghwa PT manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT  
10 Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates (such as its Fuzhou subsidiary)  
11 throughout the United States.

12 25. Defendant Chunghwa Picture Tubes (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd. ("Chunghwa Malaysia")  
13 is a Malaysian company with its principal place of business at Lot 1, Subang Hi-Tech Industrial  
14 Park, Batu Tiga, 4000 Shah Alam, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. It is a wholly-owned and  
15 controlled subsidiary of Chunghwa. Chunghwa Malaysia is focused on CRT production, and it  
16 has established itself as one of the leading worldwide suppliers of CRTs. During the Class Period,  
17 Chunghwa Malaysia manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through  
18 its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant Chunghwa PT dominated and  
19 controlled the finances, policies and affairs of Chunghwa Malaysia relating to the antitrust  
20 violations alleged in this complaint.

21 26. Defendants Chunghwa PT and Chunghwa Malaysia are collectively referred to  
22 herein as "Chunghwa."

23 **Daewoo Entities**

24 27. Defendant Daewoo International Corporation ("Daewoo International") is a  
25 corporation organized under the laws of Korea with its principal place of business located at 84-11  
26 Namdaemunno 5-ga, Jung-gu, Seoul, Korea (100-753). Daewoo International is a successor in  
27 interest to the Daewoo Group which was dismantled in or around 1999. During the Class Period,  
28 Daewoo International manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through



1 its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States.

2 28. Defendant Daewoo Electronics Corporation f/k/a Daewoo Electronics Company,  
3 Ltd. ("Daewoo Electronics") is a corporation organized under the laws of South Korea with its  
4 principal place of business located at 686 Ahyeon-dong, Mapagu, Seoul, South Korea. Daewoo  
5 Electronics is a subsidiary of Daewoo International. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that  
6 Daewoo Electronics was, along with Daewoo Telecom Company, Daewoo Corporation, and Orion  
7 Electric Components Company (all of whom were members of what is known as the "Daewoo  
8 Group"), a major shareholder of Orion Electric Company ("Orion"), a South Korean corporation  
9 that filed for bankruptcy in 2004. During the Class Period, Orion was a major manufacturer of  
10 CRT Products. In 1995, approximately 85% of Orion's \$1 billion in sales was attributed to CRT  
11 Products. Orion was involved in CRT Products sales and manufacturing joint ventures and had  
12 subsidiaries all over the world, including South Africa, France, Indonesia, Mexico, and the United  
13 States. Defendant Daewoo Electronics and Orion were 50/50 joint venture partners in an entity  
14 called Daewoo-Orion Société Anonyme ("DOSA") in France. As of approximately 1996, DOSA  
15 produced 1.2 million CRTs annually. Daewoo sold DOSA's CRT business in or around 2004. In  
16 December 1995, Orion partnered with Defendant Toshiba Corporation and two other non-  
17 Defendant entities to form P.T. Tosummit Electronic Devices Indonesia ("TEDI") in Indonesia.  
18 TEDI was projected to have an annual production capacity of 2.3 million CRTs by 1999. During  
19 the Class Period, Daewoo Electronics manufactured, marketed, sold and/or distributed CRTs  
20 and/or CRT Products, either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates (specifically including  
21 Orion and DOSA), to customers throughout the United States. Defendants Daewoo International  
22 and Daewoo Electronics dominated and controlled the policies and affairs of Orion and DOSA  
23 relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint

24 29. Daewoo International, Daewoo Electronics, Orion, and DOSA are collectively  
25 referred to herein as "Daewoo."

26 **Hitachi Entities**

27 30. Defendant Hitachi, Ltd. is a Japanese company with its principal executive office at  
28 6-6, Marunouchi 1-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 100-8280, Japan. Hitachi, Ltd. is the parent

1 company for the Hitachi brand of CRT Products. In 1996, Hitachi, Ltd.'s worldwide market share  
2 for color CRTs was 20 percent. During the Class Period, Hitachi, Ltd. manufactured, sold, and  
3 distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the  
4 United States.

5 31. Defendant Hitachi Displays, Ltd. ("Hitachi Displays") is a Japanese company with  
6 its principal place of business located at AKS Building, 3 Kandaneibeicho 3, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo,  
7 101-0022, Japan. Hitachi Displays, Ltd. was originally established as Mobara Works of Hitachi,  
8 Ltd. in Mobara City, Japan, in 1943. In 2002, all the departments of planning, development,  
9 design, manufacturing and sales concerned with the display business of Hitachi, Ltd. were spun  
10 off to create a separate company called Hitachi Displays. During the Class Period, Hitachi  
11 Displays sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates  
12 throughout the United States. Defendant Hitachi, Ltd. dominated and controlled the finances,  
13 policies and affairs of Hitachi Displays relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

14 32. Defendant Hitachi America, Ltd. ("Hitachi America") is a New York company  
15 with its principal place of business at 2000 Sierra Point Parkway, Brisbane, California. Hitachi  
16 America is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant Hitachi, Ltd. During the Class  
17 Period, Hitachi America sold and distributed CRT Products either directly (through, *inter alia*, its  
18 HED Home Electronics Division) or through its subsidiaries or affiliates (such as Hitachi Home  
19 Electronics (America), Inc. or Hitachi Sales Corporation of Hawaii, Inc.) throughout the United  
20 States. Defendant Hitachi, Ltd. dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of  
21 Hitachi America relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

22 33. Defendant Hitachi Asia, Ltd. ("Hitachi Asia") is a Singaporean company with its  
23 principal place of business at 16 Collyer Quay, #20-00 Hitachi Tower, Singapore 049318.  
24 Hitachi Asia is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant Hitachi, Ltd. During the  
25 Class Period, Hitachi Asia manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or  
26 through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant Hitachi, Ltd.  
27 dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of Hitachi Asia relating to the antitrust  
28 violations alleged in this complaint.

1           34. Defendant Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA) ("HEDUS") is a Delaware  
2 corporation with its principal place of business at 575 Mauldin Road Greenville, South Carolina  
3 29607. HEDUS is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant Hitachi, Ltd. During  
4 the Class Period, HEDUS manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or  
5 through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant Hitachi, Ltd.  
6 dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of HEDUS relating to the antitrust  
7 violations alleged in this complaint.

8           35. Defendant Shenzhen SEG Hitachi Color Display Devices, Ltd. ("Hitachi  
9 Shenzhen") is a Chinese company with its principal place of business located at 5001 Huanggang  
10 Road, Futian District, Shenzhen 518035, China. Hitachi Shenzhen is a wholly-owned and  
11 controlled subsidiary of Defendant Hitachi Displays. During the Class Period, Hitachi Shenzhen  
12 manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or  
13 affiliates throughout the United States. Defendants Hitachi, Ltd. and Hitachi Displays dominated  
14 and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of HEDUS relating to the antitrust violations  
15 alleged in this complaint.

16           36. Defendants Hitachi Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Hitachi America, Hitachi Asia, Hitachi  
17 Shenzhen and HEDUS are collectively referred to herein as "Hitachi." Defendant Hitachi, Ltd.  
18 dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of Hitachi Asia relating to the antitrust  
19 violations alleged in this complaint.

20           **Irico Entities**

21           37. Defendant Irico Group Corporation ("IGC") is a Chinese entity located at 1  
22 Caihong Rd., Xianyang City, Shaanxi Province 712021. Irico Group Corporation is the parent  
23 company for multiple subsidiaries engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and sale of CRT  
24 Products. During the Class Period, Irico Group Corporation manufactured, sold, and distributed  
25 CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States.

26           38. Defendant Irico Group Electronics Co., Ltd. ("IGE") is a Chinese entity located at 1  
27 Caihong Rd., Xianyang City, Shaanxi Province 712021. IGE is owned by IGC and engages in the  
28 manufacture, distribution, and sale of CRT Products. During the Class Period, IGE manufactured,

1 sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates  
2 throughout the United States. Defendant IGC dominated and controlled the finances, policies and  
3 affairs of IGE relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

4 39. Irico Display Devices Co., Ltd. ("IDDC") is a Chinese entity located at No. 16,  
5 Fenghui South Road West, District High-tech Development Zone, Xi'an, SXI 710075. IDDC is a  
6 partially-owned subsidiary of Defendant IGC. In 2006, IDDC was China's top CRT maker.  
7 During the Class Period, IDDC manufactured, distributed, and sold CRT Products either directly  
8 or through its subsidiaries or affiliates or through other Defendants in the United States.  
9 Defendant IGC dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of IDDC Asia relating  
10 to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

11 40. Defendants IGC, IGE, and IDDC are collectively referred to herein as "Irico."

12 **LG Electronics Entities**

13 41. Defendant LG Electronics, Inc. ("LGEI") is a South Korean entity headquartered at  
14 LG Twin Towers 20, Yeouido-dong, Yeongdeungpo-gu, Seoul, South Korea 150-721. In 2001,  
15 LGEI entered into a joint venture with Defendant Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. called  
16 LG.Philips Displays, in which the entities combined their CRT businesses. In 2002, LGEI had a  
17 24.4 percent worldwide CRT market share. On April 1, 2007, LG.Philips Displays became an  
18 independent company and changed its name to LP Displays International, Ltd. During the Class  
19 Period, LGEI manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its  
20 subsidiaries or affiliates (such as Zenith Electronics Corporation) throughout the United States.

21 42. Defendant LG Electronics USA, Inc. ("LGEUSA") is a Delaware corporation with  
22 its principal place of business at 1000 Sylvan Ave., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 07632. During the  
23 Class Period, LGEUSA manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or  
24 through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant LGEI dominated and  
25 controlled the finances, policies and affairs of LGEUSA relating to the antitrust violations alleged  
26 in this complaint.

27 43. Defendant LG Electronics Taiwan Taipei Co., Ltd. ("LGETT") is a Taiwanese  
28 entity with its principal place of business located at 7F, No.47, Lane3, Jihu Road, NeiHu District,

1 Taipei City, Taiwan. LGETT is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant LG  
2 Electronics, Inc. During the Class Period, LGETT manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT  
3 Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States.  
4 Defendant LGEI dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of LGETT relating to  
5 the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

6 44. Defendant LP Displays International, Ltd. ("LP Displays") is a Hong Kong  
7 company located at 6th Floor, ING Tower, 308 Des Voeux Road Central, Sheung Wan, Hong  
8 Kong. LP Displays is the successor entity to LGPD. During the Class Period, LP Displays  
9 manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or  
10 affiliates throughout the United States.

11 45. Defendants LGEI, LGEUSA, LGETT, and LP Displays are referred to collectively  
12 herein as "LG Electronics."

13 **Panasonic Entities**

14 46. Defendant Panasonic Corporation, f/k/a Matsushita Electric Industrial Co, Ltd.  
15 ("MEI"), is a Japanese entity located at 1006, Oaza Kadoma, Kadoma-shi, Osaka 571-8501,  
16 Japan. The entity known as MEI operated under that name until October 1, 2008 when it changed  
17 its name to Panasonic Corporation. In 2002, MEI entered into a joint venture with Defendant  
18 Toshiba Corporation called Matsushita Toshiba Picture Display Co., Ltd. to manufacture CRTs.  
19 MEI was the majority owner with 64.5 percent. On April 3, 2007, MEI purchased the remaining  
20 35.5 percent stake in the joint venture, making it a wholly-owned subsidiary of MEI. Panasonic  
21 Corporation is best known for its Panasonic brand, which in 2005 had the highest CRT revenue in  
22 Japan. During the Class Period, MEI sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through  
23 its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States.

24 47. Defendant Matsushita Electronic Corporation (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd. ("Matsushita  
25 Malaysia") is a Malaysian entity located at Lot 1, Persiaran Tengku Ampuan Section 21, Shah  
26 Alam Industrial Site, Shah Alam Malaysia 40000. Matsushita Malaysia is a wholly-owned and  
27 controlled subsidiary of Defendant Panasonic Corporation (formerly MEI). During the Class  
28 Period, Matsushita Malaysia sold and distributed CRT Products manufactured by MEI either



1 directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates. Defendant Panasonic Corporation (formerly MEI)  
2 dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of Matsushita Malaysia relating to the  
3 antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

4 48. Defendant Panasonic Corporation of North America ("PCNA") is a Delaware  
5 corporation with its principal place of business at One Panasonic Way, Secaucus, New Jersey  
6 07094. PCNA is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant Panasonic Corporation.  
7 During the Class Period, PCNA sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its  
8 subsidiaries or affiliates (such as Panasonic Digital Security & Imaging Co., Panasonic Logistics  
9 Co., and Panasonic Broadcast & Television Systems Co.) or Panasonic Company West of  
10 America) throughout the United States. Defendant Panasonic Corporation (f/k/a MEI) dominated  
11 and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of PCNA relating to the antitrust violations alleged  
12 in this complaint.

13 49. Defendant Panasonic Consumer Electronics Co. ("PACEC") is a Delaware  
14 corporation with its principal place of business at One Panasonic Way, Secaucus, New Jersey  
15 07094. PACEC is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant PCNA. During the  
16 Class Period, PACEC sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries  
17 or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant Panasonic Corporation (formerly MEI)  
18 dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of PACEC relating to the antitrust  
19 violations alleged in this complaint.

20 50. Defendants Panasonic Corporation (f/k/a MEI), Matsushita Malaysia, PCNA, and  
21 PACEC are collectively referred to herein as "Panasonic."

22 **Philips Entities**

23 51. Defendant Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. ("Royal Philips"), which translates  
24 to Royal Philips Electronics, is a Dutch entity with its principal place of business at Breitner  
25 Center, Amstelplein 2, 1096 BC Amsterdam, The Netherlands. In 2000, Royal Philips was the  
26 leading global supplier of CRTs. Royal Philips operated in Asia directly through divisions (such  
27 as Philips Components Asia and Philips BGTV) and through wholly-owned and separately  
28 incorporated subsidiaries. In 2001, Royal Philips entered into a joint venture with Defendant LG



1 Electronics called LG.Philips Displays ("LGPD"), in which the entities combined their CRT  
2 businesses. LGPD operated in Asia and in Europe through its division LG.Philips Displays  
3 Europe Region. On April 1, 2007, LG.Philips Displays became an independent company and  
4 changed its name to LP Displays International, Ltd. During the Class Period, Royal Philips  
5 manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or  
6 affiliates throughout the United States.

7 52. Defendant Philips Electronics Industries Ltd. ("PEIL") is a Taiwanese corporation  
8 with its principal place of business at 15F, 3-1 Yuanqu St., Nangang District, Taipei 115, Taiwan.  
9 PEIL is a subsidiary of Defendant Royal Philips. During the Class Period, PEIL sold and  
10 distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the  
11 United States. Defendant Royal Philips dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs  
12 of PEIL relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

13 53. Defendant Philips Electronics North America ("Philips America") is a Delaware  
14 corporation with its principal place of business at 1251 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New  
15 York, 10020. Philips America is a subsidiary of Defendant Royal Philips. During the Class  
16 Period, Philips America sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its  
17 subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant Royal Philips dominated and  
18 controlled the finances, policies and affairs of Philips America relating to the antitrust violations  
19 alleged in this complaint.

20 54. Defendant Philips Consumer Electronics Co. ("PCEC") has its principal place of  
21 business at 64 Perimeter Center E, Atlanta, GA 30346-2295. PCEC is a subsidiary of Defendant  
22 Royal Philips. During the Class Period, PCEC sold and distributed CRT Products either directly  
23 or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant Royal Philips  
24 dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of PCEC relating to the antitrust  
25 violations alleged in this complaint.

26 55. Defendant Philips Electronics Industries (Taiwan), Ltd. ("Philips Taiwan") is a  
27 Taiwanese company with its principal place of business located at 15F 3-1 Yuanqu Street,  
28 Nangang District, Taipei, Taiwan. Philips Taiwan is a subsidiary of Defendant Royal Philips.

1 During the Class Period, Philips Taiwan sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or  
2 through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant Royal Philips  
3 dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of Philips Taiwan relating to the  
4 antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

5 56. Defendant Philips da Amazonia Industria Electronica Ltda. ("Philips Brazil") is a  
6 Brazilian company with its principal place of business located at Av Torquato Tapajos 2236, 1  
7 andar (parte 1), Flores, Manaus, AM 39048-660, Brazil. Philips Brazil is a wholly-owned and  
8 controlled subsidiary of Defendant Royal Philips. During the Class Period, Philips Brazil sold and  
9 distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the  
10 United States. Defendant Royal Philips dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs  
11 of Philips Brazil relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

12 57. Defendants Royal Philips, PEIL, PCEC, Philips America, Philips Taiwan and  
13 Philips Brazil are collectively referred to herein as "Philips."

14 **Samsung Entities**

15 58. Defendant Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. ("SEC") is a South Korean company  
16 with its principal place of business at 250, 2-ga, Taepyong-ro, Jung-gu, Seoul 100-742, South  
17 Korea. It is South Korea's top electronics company. During the Class Period, SEC manufactured,  
18 sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates  
19 throughout the United States.

20 59. Defendant Samsung Electronics America, Inc. ("SEAI") is a New York corporation  
21 with its principal place of business located at 105 Challenger Road, 6th Floor, Ridgefield Park,  
22 New Jersey 07660. SEAI is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant SEC. During  
23 the Class Period, SEAI manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or  
24 through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant SEC dominated and  
25 controlled the finances, policies and affairs of Samsung SEAI relating to the antitrust violations  
26 alleged in this complaint.

27 60. Defendant Samsung SDI (Malaysia) Sdn Bhd. ("Samsung Malaysia") is a  
28 Malaysian corporation with its principal place of business at Lots 635 & 660, Kawasan

1 Perindustrian, Tuanku Jafaar, 71450 Sungai Gadut, Negeri Sembilan Darul Khusus, Malaysia.  
2 Samsung Malaysia is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant SEC. During the  
3 Class Period, Samsung Malaysia sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its  
4 subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant SEC dominated and controlled  
5 the finances, policies and affairs of Samsung Malaysia relating to the antitrust violations alleged in  
6 this complaint.

7 61. Defendant Samsung SDI Co., Ltd. f/k/a Samsung Display Device Company  
8 ("Samsung SDI") is a South Korean company with its principal place of business at 15th – 18th  
9 Floor, Samsung Life Insurance Building, 150, 2-ga, Taepyong-ro, Jung-gu, Seoul, 100-716, South  
10 Korea. Samsung SDI is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant SEC. Samsung  
11 SDI is one of the largest CRT producers in the world. Samsung SDI was the top manufacturer for  
12 CRTs in 2000, with a market share of approximately 20%. During the Class Period, Samsung SDI  
13 manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or  
14 affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant SEC dominated and controlled the finances,  
15 policies and affairs of Samsung SDI relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

16 62. Defendant Samsung SDI America, Inc. ("Samsung America") is a California  
17 corporation with its principal place of business at 3333 Michelson Drive, Suite 700, Irvine,  
18 California. Samsung America is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant Samsung  
19 SDI. During the Class Period, Samsung America sold and distributed CRT Products either  
20 directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant SEC and  
21 Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of Samsung America  
22 relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

23 63. Defendant Samsung SDI Mexico S.A. de C.V. ("Samsung SDI Mexico") is a  
24 Mexican company with its principal place of business located at Blvd. Los Olivos, No.21014,  
25 Parque Industrial El Florido, Tijuana, B.C. Mexico. Samsung SDI Mexico is a wholly-owned and  
26 controlled subsidiary of Defendant Samsung SDI. During the Class Period, Samsung SDI Mexico  
27 sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates  
28 throughout the United States. Defendants SEC and Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the

1 finances, policies and affairs of Samsung SDI Mexico relating to the antitrust violations alleged in  
2 this complaint.

3         64. Defendant Samsung SDI Brasil Ltda. ("Samsung SDI Brazil") is a Brazilian  
4 company with its principal place of business located at Av. Eixo Norte Sul, S/N, Distrito  
5 Industrial, 69088-480 Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil. Samsung SDI Brazil is a wholly-owned and  
6 controlled subsidiary of Defendant Samsung SDI. During the Class Period, Samsung SDI Brazil  
7 sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates  
8 throughout the United States. Defendants SEC and Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the  
9 finances, policies and affairs of Samsung SDI Brazil relating to the antitrust violations alleged in  
10 this complaint.

11         65. Defendant Shenzhen Samsung SDI Co. Ltd. ("Samsung SDI Shenzhen") is a  
12 Chinese company with its principal place of business located at Huanggang Bei Lu, Futian Gu,  
13 Shenzhen, China. Samsung SDI Shenzhen is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of  
14 Defendant Samsung SDI. During the Class Period, Samsung SDI Shenzhen sold and distributed  
15 CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States.  
16 Defendants SEC and Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of  
17 Samsung SDI Shenzhen relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

18         66. Defendant Tianjin Samsung SDI Co., Ltd. ("Samsung SDI Tianjin") is a Chinese  
19 company with its principal place of business located at Developing Zone of Yi-Xian Park, Wuqing  
20 County, Tianjin, China. Samsung SDI Tianjin is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of  
21 Defendant Samsung SDI. During the Class Period, Samsung SDI Tianjin sold and distributed CRT  
22 Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States.  
23 Defendants SEC and Samsung SDI dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of  
24 Samsung SDI Tianjin relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

25         67. Defendants SEC, Samsung SDI, Samsung America, Samsung SDI Mexico,  
26 Samsung SDI Brazil, Samsung SDI Shenzhen, Samsung SDI Tianjin and Samsung Malaysia are  
27 collectively referred to herein as "Samsung."

1           **Samtel**

2           68. Defendant Samtel Color, Ltd. ("Samtel") is an Indian company with its principal  
3 place of business at 52, Community Centre, New Friends Colony, New Delhi-110065. Samtel's  
4 market share for CPTs sold in India is approximately 40%, and it is that country's largest exporter  
5 of CPT Products. Samtel has gained safety approvals from the United States, Canada, Germany,  
6 and Great Britain for its CPT Products. During the Class Period, Samtel manufactured, sold, and  
7 distributed CPT Products throughout the United States.

8           **Tatung Company of America, Inc.**

9           69. Tatung Company of America, Inc. ("Tatung America") is a California corporation  
10 with its principal place of business located at 2850 El Presidio Street, Long Beach, California.  
11 Tatung America is a subsidiary of Tatung Company. Currently, Tatung Company owns  
12 approximately half of Tatung America. The other half used to be owned by Lun Kuan Lin, the  
13 daughter of Tatung Company's former Chairman, T.S. Lin. Following Lun Kuan Lin's recent  
14 death, her share passed to her two children. During the Class Period, Tatung America  
15 manufactured, marketed, sold and/or distributed CRT Products manufactured by, among others,  
16 Chungwa Picture Tubes, Ltd., either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the  
17 United States.

18           **Thai CRT**

19           70. Defendant Thai CRT Company, Ltd. ("Thai CRT") is a Thai company located at  
20 1/F 26 Siam Cement Rd., Bangsue Dusit, Bangkok, Thailand. Thai CRT is a subsidiary of Siam  
21 Cement Group, and it was established in 1986 as Thailand's first manufacturer of CRTs for color  
22 televisions. During the Class Period, Thai CRT manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products  
23 either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States.

24           **Toshiba Entities**

25           71. Defendant Toshiba Corporation ("TC") is a Japanese company with its principal  
26 place of business at 1-1, Shibaura 1-chome, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105-8001, Japan. In 2001, Toshiba  
27 held a 5 to 10 percent worldwide market share for CRTs used in televisions and in computer  
28 monitors. In 2002, TC entered into a joint venture with Defendant MEI (now Panasonic



1 Corporation) called Matsushita Toshiba Picture Display Co., Ltd., in which the entities  
2 consolidated their CRT businesses. During the Class Period, TC manufactured, sold, and  
3 distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the  
4 United States.

5 72. Defendant Toshiba America, Inc. ("Toshiba America") is a Delaware corporation  
6 with its principal place of business at 1251 Avenue of the Americas, Suite 4110, New York, NY  
7 10020. Toshiba America is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant TC. During  
8 the Class Period, Toshiba America sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its  
9 subsidiaries or affiliates (such as Toshiba Hawaii, Inc.) throughout the United States. Defendant  
10 TC dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of Toshiba America relating to the  
11 antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

12 73. Defendant Toshiba America Consumer Products LLC ("TACP") is a limited  
13 liability company that is headquartered at 82 Totawa Rd., Wayne, New Jersey 07470-3114.  
14 TACP is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant TC through Toshiba America.  
15 During the Class Period, TACP sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its  
16 subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant TC dominated and controlled the  
17 finances, policies and affairs of TACP relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

18 74. Defendant Toshiba America Consumer Products, Inc. ("TACPI") is a company that  
19 is headquartered at 1420-B Toshiba Drive, Lebanon, Tennessee, 37087. TACPI is a wholly-  
20 owned and controlled subsidiary of Defendant TC through Toshiba America. During the Class  
21 Period, TACP sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or  
22 affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant TC dominated and controlled the finances,  
23 policies and affairs of TACPI relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

24 75. Defendant Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc. ("TAEP") is  
25 headquartered at 9740 Irvine Blvd., Irvine, California 92718-1697. TAEP is a wholly-owned and  
26 controlled subsidiary of Defendant TC through Toshiba America. During the Class Period, TAEP  
27 sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates  
28 throughout the United States. Defendant TC dominated and controlled the finances, policies and



1 affairs of TAEP relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

2 76. Defendant Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc. ("TAIP") is headquartered  
3 at 9740 Irvine Blvd., Irvine, California 92718-1697. TAIP is a wholly-owned and controlled  
4 subsidiary of Defendant TC through Toshiba America. During the Class Period, TAIP sold and  
5 distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the  
6 United States. Defendant TC dominated and controlled the finances, policies and affairs of TAIP  
7 relating to the antitrust violations alleged in this complaint.

8 77. Toshiba Display Devices (Thailand) Company, Ltd. ("TDDT") is a Thai company  
9 with its principal place of business located at 142 Moo 5 Bangkadi Industrial Estate, Tivanon  
10 Road, Pathum Thani, Thailand 12000. TDDT is a wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of  
11 Defendant TC. During the Class Period, TAIP sold and distributed CRT Products either directly or  
12 through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States. Defendant TC dominated and  
13 controlled the finances, policies and affairs of TAIP relating to the antitrust violations alleged in  
14 this complaint.

15 78. Defendants TC, Toshiba America, TDDT, TACP, TACPI, TAEP and TAIP are  
16 referred to collectively as "Toshiba."

17 **Joint Ventures**

18 79. Defendant MT Picture Display Co., Ltd., f/k/a Matsushita Toshiba Picture Display  
19 Co., Ltd. ("MTPD") is a Japanese entity located at 1-1, Saiwai-cho., Takatsuki-shi, Osaka 569-  
20 1193, Japan. MTPD was formed as a CRT joint venture between Defendants Panasonic  
21 Corporation (f/k/a MEI) and Toshiba. On April 3, 2007, Defendant MEI purchased the remaining  
22 stake in MTPD, making it a wholly-owned subsidiary. During the class period, MTPD  
23 manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly or through its subsidiaries or  
24 affiliates throughout the United States.

25 80. Defendant Beijing-Matsushita Color CRT Company, Ltd. ("BMCC") is a Chinese  
26 company with its principal place of business at No. 9 Jiuxianqiao N. Rd., Dashanzi Chaoyang  
27 District, Beijing, China. BMCC is the second largest producer of CRTs for televisions in China.  
28 During the Class Period, BMCC manufactured, sold, and distributed CRT Products either directly

1 or through its subsidiaries or affiliates throughout the United States.

#### 2 IV. AGENTS AND CO-CONSPIRATORS

3 81. Various persons that are not named as Defendants herein have participated in the  
4 violations alleged herein and have performed acts and made statements in furtherance thereof.  
5 Plaintiffs reserve the right to name some or all of these persons as Defendants at a later date.

6 82. Whenever in this complaint reference is made to any act, deed or transaction of any  
7 corporation, the allegation means that the corporation engaged in the act, deed or transaction by or  
8 through its officers, directors, agents, employees or representatives while they were actively  
9 engaged in the management, direction, control or transaction of the corporation's business or  
10 affairs.

11 83. Defendants are also liable for acts done in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy by  
12 companies they acquired through mergers and acquisitions.

13 84. Each of the Defendants named herein acted as the agent of, co-conspirator with, or  
14 joint venturer of the other Defendants with respect to the acts, violations and common course of  
15 conduct alleged herein. Each Defendant that is a subsidiary of a foreign parent acts as the United  
16 States agent for CRTs and/or CRT Products made by its parent company.

#### 17 V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

18 85. Plaintiffs bring this action both on behalf of themselves, and as a class action  
19 pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23(a) and (b)(3), on behalf of the following  
20 class (the "Class").

21 All persons and entities who, between March 1, 1995 and November 25, 2007,  
22 directly purchased a CRT Product in the United States from any defendant or any  
23 subsidiary or affiliate thereof, or any co-conspirator. Excluded from the Class are  
24 Defendants, their parent companies, subsidiaries and affiliates, any co-  
25 conspirators, all governmental entities, and any judges or justices assigned to hear  
26 any aspect of this action.

27 86. The Class definition encompasses those who bought a CRT Product directly from a  
28 Defendant, even if the CRT contained therein was manufactured by an affiliated entity, principal,  
agent, or co-conspirator.

87. Plaintiffs do not know the exact number of Class members because such

1 information is in the exclusive control of Defendants. Plaintiffs believe that, due to the nature of  
2 the trade and commerce involved, there are most likely thousands of Class members,  
3 geographically dispersed throughout the United States such that joinder of all class members is  
4 impracticable.

5 88. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Class in that Plaintiffs are direct  
6 purchasers of CRT Products. All Class members were damaged by the same wrongful conduct of  
7 Defendants and their co-conspirators as alleged herein, and the relief sought is common to the  
8 class.

9 89. Numerous questions of law or fact arise from Defendants' anticompetitive conduct  
10 that is common to the Class, including but not limited to:

11 a. Whether Defendants engaged in a contract, combination, and/or conspiracy  
12 to fix, raise, maintain, or stabilize prices of CRT Products sold in the United States;

13 b. Whether Defendants engaged in a contract, combination, and/or conspiracy  
14 to restrict output of CRT Products sold in the United States

15 c. Whether Defendants shared non-public information, allocated markets and  
16 customers, restricted output of CRT Products sold in the United States and committed other  
17 conduct in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy;

18 d. Whether Defendants' conduct caused the prices of CRT Products sold in the  
19 United States to be at artificially high and noncompetitive levels;

20 e. Whether Plaintiffs and the other members of the Class were injured by  
21 Defendants' conduct, and, if so, the appropriate class-wide measure of damages for Class  
22 members; and

23 f. The scope of any injunctive relief to which Plaintiffs and the other members  
24 of the Class are entitled.

25 90. These and other questions of law and fact are common to the Class, and  
26 predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class members.

27 91. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Class because Plaintiffs directly  
28 purchased CRT Products from one or more of the Defendants.

92. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Class in that Plaintiffs are direct purchasers of CRT Products and have no conflict with any other members of the Class. Furthermore, Plaintiffs have retained competent counsel experienced in antitrust, class action, and other complex litigation.

93. Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to the Class as a whole.

94. This class action is superior to the alternatives, if any, for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Prosecution as a class action will eliminate the possibility of repetitive litigation. There will be no material difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

95. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications, establishing incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants.

## VI. TRADE AND COMMERCE

96. During the Class Period, each Defendant, or one or more of its subsidiaries, sold CRT Products in the United States in a continuous and uninterrupted flow of interstate commerce and foreign commerce, including through and into this judicial district.

97. During the Class Period, Defendants collectively controlled a majority of the market for CRT Products, both globally and in the United States.

98. The business activities of the Defendants substantially affected interstate trade and commerce in the United States and caused antitrust injury in the United States.

## VII. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

### A. CRT Technology and Products

99. A CRT has three components: (a) one or more electron guns, each of which is a series of metallic structures used to generate a beam of electrons; (b) a magnetic or other deflection system used to aim the electron beam; and (c) a phosphor-coated glass faceplate that phosphoresces when struck by an electron beam, thereby producing a viewable image. A faceplate coated with one color of phosphor produces a monochromatic image, while a faceplate coated

1 with multiple colors of phosphor produces a polychromatic image. An aperture or shadow mask--a  
2 thin screen of perforated metal--is welded to the faceplate panel and, to produce a color image, is  
3 coated and rinsed multiple times, leaving a surface of thousands of narrow lines of red, green, blue  
4 and black.

5 100. CRT technology was first developed more than a century ago. The first  
6 commercially practical CRT television was made in 1931. However, it was not until RCA  
7 Corporation introduced the product at the 1939 World's Fair that it became widely available to  
8 consumers. Since then, CRTs have become the heart of most display products, including  
9 televisions, computer monitors, oscilloscopes, air traffic control monitors, and ATMs. Even large  
10 public displays, including many scoreboards at sports arenas, are comprised of thousands of  
11 single-color CRTs.

12 101. The quality of a CRT itself determines the quality of the CRT display. No external  
13 control or feature can make up for a poor quality tube. In this regard, the CRT defines the whole  
14 CRT product so that the product is often simply referred to as "the CRT."

15 102. Early CRT televisions displayed only black and white images. CRT technology  
16 was revolutionized in 1950 with the advent of the color CRTs. Although there have been  
17 refinements and incremental advancements along the way since then, such as the development of  
18 thinner CRTs and CRTs with a flat screen, the CRT technology used today is similar to the one  
19 that RCA unveiled in 1950.

20 103. CRTs can be subdivided into CDTs and CPTs. As noted above, CPTs are used  
21 primarily in televisions and related devices and CDTs are primarily used in computer monitors  
22 and similar devices. The primary difference is that CDTs typically yield a higher resolution image  
23 requiring more pixels than do CPTs.

24 104. Until the last few years, CRTs were the dominant technology used in displays,  
25 including televisions and computer monitors. During the Class Period, this translated into the sale  
26 of millions of CRT Products, generating billions of dollars in annual profits. The following data  
27 was reported by Stanford Resources, Inc., a market research firm focused on the global electronic  
28 display industry:



Year	Units Sold (millions)	Revenue (billion US dollars)	Average Selling Price Per Unit
1998	90.5	\$18.9	\$208
1999	106.3	\$19.2	\$181
2000	119.0	\$28.0 <sup>1</sup>	\$235

105. CRTs are a declining but still popular technology. CRT televisions typically require a deep cabinet to accommodate the vacuum tube assembly. In the 1990s, technological innovations allowed companies to introduce flat panel displays that are slimmer and less bulky than CRT displays. Flat panel displays were introduced in consumer products such as computer monitors and televisions. Before their introduction, CRTs had dominated the market for these applications.

106. As the established technology, CRTs had a price advantage over these new technologies. Unlike an emerging industry where participants must invest heavily in research, development, and bringing capacity online, the CRT industry made and recouped such investments well before the start of the Class Period. Thus, CRT manufacturers had very little debt or interest expense on their CRT manufacturing facilities, and the pressure to produce at full capacity (to avoid default) was lessened. This provided an environment in which collusion to fix prices, even at the risk of lower demand, was possible.

107. The CRT industry faced significant market pressures and reduced profitability during the latter part of the Class Period due in part to the introduction and rise of competing television technologies, such as plasma screens and liquid crystal display ("LCD") technology.

108. Nonetheless, this decline took some time to materialize. In 2004, it was estimated that CRT televisions constituted 75% of the North American television market, accounting for 19.32 million units. In 2006, the market research firm iSuppli Corp. ("iSuppli") estimated that CRT televisions still accounted for only 46% of all televisions shipped to North American retailers

---

<sup>1</sup> Estimated market value of CRT units sold.



1 and the global market share for CRTs in that period was approximately 71%.

2 109. In 2006, iSuppli predicted that sales of LCD televisions in 2007 would, for the first  
3 time, surpass sales of CRT televisions. The firm forecasted that sales of CRTs would fall from an  
4 estimated 14.4 million units in 2006 to 10.4 million units in 2007. iSuppli predicted that CRT  
5 televisions would account for only 2.1 million of the 44 million televisions sold in 2010.

6 110. CRTs still remain popular, however. For example, in the weeks leading up to the  
7 2007 Super Bowl, unit sales of CRTs increased 60%, while revenues increased by 46%. At the  
8 Consumer Electronics Show ("CES") held in Las Vegas in 2007, Samsung introduced a new line  
9 of "slim" CRTs intended to emulate the form factor of flat panel LCD televisions. CRTs also  
10 remain popular with visual effects technicians, in schools and in other public areas for their  
11 combination of color calibration, price and durability, as well as in developing countries like  
12 China. CRT technology is also holding its own in the area of low-cost monitor and smaller size  
13 televisions. According to DisplaySearch Inc. ("DSI"), a Texas based research firm, CRTs will  
14 maintain a 65 percent share of 25-inch to 29-inch displays sold in 2009, whereas CRTs will have  
15 only a 1 percent share of 35-inch to 39-inch displays sold in 2009.

16 111. DSI further estimates that the worldwide capacity to manufacture CRTs will fall  
17 from over 250 million units in 2006 to less than 150 million units by 2010. At various times  
18 during the conspiracy, in order to keep prices high, Defendants colluded to restrain output of  
19 CRTs, as alleged below.

## 20 **B. Oligopolistic Nature of the CRT Industry**

21 112. During the Class Period, the CRT industry has been dominated by relatively few  
22 companies. In 2002 for example, three companies – Defendants LP Displays (formerly known as  
23 LGPD), Samsung, and Chunghwa – controlled approximately 62 percent of the CRT market, as  
24 reflected in the following chart:

Company	Share
LGPD	27%
Samsung SDI	24%
Chunghwa PT	11%
Japanese Producers <sup>2</sup>	15%
Others	23%

113. The CRT industry also had significant consolidation during the Class Period, including but not limited to: (a) the creation of LGPD in 2001, which was a joint venture involving Philips' and LG Electronics' CRT businesses; and (b) the 2002 merger of Toshiba's and MEI's CRT businesses into MTPD.

114. This concentration of market share facilitated Defendants' ability to implement the conspiracy. Involvement in long-standing joint ventures, both in the CRT market and closely related markets, also gave these supposed competitors continuous opportunities to discuss pricing, capacity utilization, and other important prospective market information. The mutually beneficial nature of the business relations between certain Defendants not only provided the opportunity to conspire; it also created a financial incentive to do so.

115. The concentration of the CRT industry was further exacerbated by various types of intercompetition or cooperation.

116. Chunghwa, for example, has a long-standing joint venture with Defendant Samsung's corporate parent for the production of liquid crystal display panels. Defendant Chunghwa now licenses technology from Philips, although this is a recent development that helped resolve a patent infringement suit filed in 2002. Chunghwa also entered into multiple technology transfer agreements with Toshiba, including one entered into in 1995.

117. Similarly, Samsung's corporate family has a very long-standing relationship with Chinese state-owned picture tube manufacturers, dating back to a 1993 joint venture.

---

<sup>2</sup> "Japanese Producers" includes Defendants Hitachi and Toshiba.

1 118. Likewise, LG Electronics and Hitachi entered into a joint venture in 2000 for the  
2 manufacture, sale, and distribution of optical storage products such as DVD drives.

3 119. Samtel also participates in a joint venture, Samcor Glass Limited, with Defendant  
4 Samsung's corporate parent and non-Defendant Corning Inc., USA for the production and supply  
5 of picture tube glass.

6 120. Furthermore, at least four of the competitors obtain picture tubes from the same  
7 Indian company. Samtel claims to have supplied CRTs to Defendants LG Electronics, Samsung,  
8 Philips, and Panasonic during at least part of the Class Period.

9 121. Similarly, Orion participates in a joint venture for the manufacture of CRT products  
10 with Defendant Toshiba, as well as non-Defendants P.T. Tabung Gambar Indonesia and the  
11 Japanese trading company Sumitomo Corporation.

### 12 **C. International Antitrust Investigations**

13 122. Defendants have been the subject of multiple government investigations for their  
14 cartel activity in recent years. For example, Samsung admitted guilt and paid a \$300 million fine  
15 following an investigation by the DOJ into price-fixing among manufacturers of dynamic random  
16 access memory ("DRAM") computer chips.

17 123. More recently, the DOJ and the European Commission ("EC") have commenced  
18 investigations of Samsung, Toshiba, LGPD and Hitachi, among others, concerning collusion  
19 among manufacturers of thin-film transistor liquid crystal displays ("TFT-LCDs"). Samsung,  
20 Toshiba and Hitachi are also being investigated by the DOJ in connection with the price-fixing of  
21 flash memory computer chips.

22 124. In December of 2008, it was announced that LP Display would plead guilty to a  
23 DOJ indictment alleging antitrust price-fixing allegations with respect to TFT-LCDs. It has agreed  
24 to pay a \$400 million fine. Likewise, Chunghwa PT pled guilty to participation in the same  
25 conspiracy and was fined \$65 million. In January of 2009, it was announced that C.Y. Lin  
26 (Chunghwa PT's former Chairman and CEO); Wen Jung Cheng (Assistant Vice-President of  
27 Marketing & Sales for Chunghwa PT); Duk Mo Koo (Executive Vice-President & Chief Sales  
28 Officer for LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd.); Chang Suk Chung (Vice-President of Monitor Sales for

1 LG Display, Ltd., the predecessor of LP Display); Chih-Chun Liu (Chunghwa PT's Vice-President  
2 of LCD Sales); and Hsueh-Lung Lee (also one of Chunghwa PT's Vice-Presidents of LCD Sales)  
3 pled guilty to participation in the TFT-LCD conspiracy. Wen Jung Cheng (Assistant Vice-  
4 President of Marketing & Sales for Chunghwa PT) and Duk Mo Koo (Executive Vice-President &  
5 Chief Sales Officer for LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd.) have also been indicted in connection with the  
6 DOJ's TFT-LCD investigation. As explained below, Mr. Lin is involved in the conspiracy relating  
7 to CRT Products. It is believed that several of the other individuals are involved as well. Most  
8 recently, on March 10, 2009, it was announced that Hitachi Displays had pled guilty to  
9 participation in the price-fixing conspiracy involving TFT-LCDs and had agreed to pay a \$31  
10 million fine.

11 125. Many of the Defendants are currently under investigation by government  
12 authorities around the world for anticompetitive conduct in connection with the CRT industry.  
13 The United States investigation of the CRT conspiracy is being conducted by the DOJ's Antitrust  
14 Division's office in the Northern District of California.

15 126. On February 10, 2009, C.Y. Lin of Chunghwa PT was indicted for participating in  
16 a conspiracy to fix the prices of CRTs. The DOJ's announcement of the indictment explained it as  
17 follows:

18 The indictment, filed today in U.S. District Court in San Francisco, charges Cheng  
19 Yuan Lin, aka C.Y. Lin, a resident of Taiwan, with conspiring with others to  
20 suppress and eliminate competition by fixing prices, reducing output and  
21 allocating market shares of color display tubes (CDTs) to be sold in the U.S. and  
22 elsewhere, beginning at least as early as Jan. 28, 1997, until at least as late as  
23 April 7, 2003. The indictment also charges C.Y. Lin with conspiring with others  
24 to suppress and eliminate competition by fixing prices for color picture tubes  
25 (CPTs) to be sold in the U.S. and elsewhere, beginning at least as early as March  
26 12, 1997, until at least as late as April 7, 2003.

27 CRTs consist of evacuated glass envelopes that contain an electron gun and a  
28 phosphorescent screen. When electrons strike the screen, light is emitted, creating  
an image on the screen. CDTs and CPTs are each types of CRTs. CDTs are used  
in computer monitors and other specialized applications, while CPTs are used in  
color televisions. The worldwide market for CRTs, including CPTs and CDTs, in  
1997, at the start of the conspiracies has been estimated as approximately \$26  
billion.

"This conspiracy harmed countless Americans who purchased computers and  
televisions using cathode ray tubes sold at fixed prices," said Scott D. Hammond,

1 Acting Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division. "The  
2 Antitrust Division will continue to prosecute individuals, wherever they are  
3 located and however high their position on the corporate ladder, who engage in  
4 price fixing aimed at U.S. businesses and consumers."

5 According to the charges, C.Y. Lin and co-conspirators carried out the CDT  
6 conspiracy by, among other things:

7 --Attending meetings and engaging in conversations and communications  
8 in Taiwan, Korea, Malaysia, China and elsewhere to discuss the prices,  
9 output and market shares of CDTs;

10 --Agreeing during those meetings, conversations and communications to  
11 charge prices of CDTs at certain target levels or ranges;

12 --Agreeing during those meetings, conversations and communications to  
13 reduce output of CDTs by shutting down CDT production lines for certain  
14 periods of time;

15 --Agreeing during those meetings, conversations and communications to  
16 allocate target market shares for the CDT market overall and for certain  
17 CDT customers;

18 --Exchanging CDT sales, production, market share and pricing information  
19 for the purpose of implementing, monitoring and enforcing adherence to  
20 the agreed-upon prices, output reduction and market share allocation;

21 --Implementing an auditing system that permitted co-conspirators to visit  
22 each other's production facilities to verify that CDT production lines had  
23 been shut down as agreed;

24 --Authorizing and approving the participation of subordinate employees in  
25 the conspiracy;

26 --Issuing price quotations and reducing output in accordance with the  
27 agreements reached; and

28 --Taking steps to conceal the conspiracy and conspiratorial contacts  
through various means.

C.Y. Lin is charged with carrying out the CPT conspiracy with his co-conspirators  
by, among other things:

--Attending meetings and engaging in conversations and communications  
in Taiwan, Korea, Malaysia, China, Thailand, Indonesia and elsewhere to  
discuss the prices of CPTs;

--Agreeing during those meetings, conversations and communications to  
charge prices of CPTs at certain target levels or ranges;

--Exchanging CPT pricing information for the purpose of implementing,  
monitoring and enforcing adherence to the agreed-upon prices;



--Authorizing and approving the participation of subordinate employees in the conspiracy;

--Issuing price quotations in accordance with the agreements reached; and

--Taking steps to conceal the conspiracy and conspiratorial contacts through various means.<sup>3</sup>

127. The DOJ is not acting alone against the manufacturers of CRTs. Multiple foreign antitrust enforcement authorities are also investigating the CRT cartel.

128. On November 8, 2007, it was reported that EC officials carried out unannounced raids on manufacturers of CRTs based on suspected anticompetitive conduct. That same day, the EC issued a press release stating that, “[t]he commission has reason to believe that the companies concerned may have violated EU rules against price-fixing, sharing markets or exchanging market information.”

129. On November 9, 2007, MEI (now known as Panasonic Corporation) and Samsung reported that they were cooperating with the Japanese Fair Trade Commission (“JFTC”), which raided the companies’ CRT production facilities on suspicion of anticompetitive conduct.

130. On that same day, a Samsung spokesperson announced that its CRT subsidiary in South Korea was being investigated by the Korean Fair Trade Commission (“KFTC”) as “part of an international probe into alleged price-fixing.”

131. On November 12, 2007, Chunghwa announced that it had received a summons from the DOJ with respect to involvement in a CRT price-fixing cartel.

132. And on November 21, 2007, Defendant Philips acknowledged that it was being investigated as well. The *International Herald Tribune* reported that “competition authorities in several jurisdictions had started investigations,” and that the company “would assist regulators.”

133. On May 6, 2008, the Hungarian Competition Authority (“HCA”) announced its own investigation into the CRT cartel. The HCA described the cartel as follows:

---

<sup>3</sup> The significance of the April 7, 2003 ending date in this indictment is that is when C.Y. Lin left the employ of Chunghwa PT.



The Hungarian Competition Authority (Gazdasági Versenyhivatal - GVH) initiated a competition supervision proceeding against the following undertakings: Samsung SDI Co. Ltd, Samsung SDI Germany GmbH, Samsung SDI Magyarország Zrt., Thomson TDP sp. Z.o.o., LG Philips Displays Czech Republic s.r.o., LP Displays, Chunghwa Pictures Tubes (UK) Ltd, Chunghwa Pictures Tubes Ltd, Daewoo Orion S.A., Daewoo Electronics Global HQ, Daewoo Electronics European HQ, MT Picture Display Germany GmbH, Matsushita Global HQ, Matsushita European HQ.

Based on the data available the undertakings mentioned above concerted their practice regarding the manufacturing and distribution of cathode-ray tubes (including coloured pictures tubes and coloured screen tubes) on the European market between 1995 and 2007. The anti-competitive behaviour may have concerned the exchange of sensitive market information (about prices, volumes sold, demand and the extent to which capacities were exploited), price-fixing, the allocation of market shares, consumers and volumes to be sold, the limitation of output and coordination concerning the production. The undertakings evolved a structural system and functional mechanism of cooperation.

According to the available evidences it is presumable that the coordination of European and Asian undertakings regarding to the European market also included Hungary from 1995 to 2007. The coordination concerning the Hungarian market allegedly formed part of the European coordination. Samsung SDI Magyarország. was called into the proceeding since it manufactured and sold cathode-ray tubes in Hungary in the examined period, and it allegedly participated in the coordination between its parent companies.

#### **D. Collusive Contacts, Meetings, And Agreements Among Members of the CRT Products Industry**

134. The antitrust conspiracy involving CRT Products went on for over twelve years (1995-2007), involved the various Defendant companies, and was effectuated through agreements and common understandings reached in at least 500 bilateral or multilateral meetings that occurred in Taiwan, South Korea, Indonesia, Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia, China, the U.K., and Europe.

135. Bilateral contacts and communications among Defendants commenced in the late 1980s-early 1990s on an *ad hoc* basis. Competitively sensitive information on pricing, production capacity, product mix and customer information was exchanged. In 1995, these bilateral meetings began to increase in frequency. There were more than a dozen such meetings in 1995 and several dozen such meetings in 1996 alone. The meetings continued throughout the Class Period. Bilateral contacts and communications were conducted in person, by telephone or by e-mail.

136. During 1995-96, certain of the Defendants commenced participation in informal group meetings. There were several such meetings in 1995 and over a dozen more in 1996. As time went on, bilateral meetings encompassed specific intercompany agreements or followed up

1 on agreements reached at group meetings. Bilateral meetings were conducted in person, by  
2 telephone or by e-mail.

3 137. Beginning in 1997, CRT makers started to meet in a more organized, systematic  
4 fashion. At some point, these meetings became known as "Glass Meetings" or "GSM." Until  
5 June of 2000, "Glass Meetings" involving CDT Products and CPT Products were typically held  
6 back to back at the same venue. Thereafter, in order to limit detection, they were held separately at  
7 different venues.

8 138. With respect to CRT Products, Defendants or their agents agreed to, *inter alia*: (a)  
9 fix target prices and price guidelines; (b) exchange pertinent information on, inter alia, shipments,  
10 prices, production, and customer demand; (c) coordinate public statements regarding available  
11 capacity and supply; (d) resolve issues created by asymmetrical vertical integration among some  
12 of the co-conspirators; (e) keep their collusive meetings secret; (f) expose cheating on the  
13 agreements and to discuss the reconciliation of accounts; (g) allocate market share of overall sales;  
14 (g) influence and, at times, coordinate pricing with producers in other geographic areas; (h) limit  
15 competition for certain key customers; (i) allocate customers; (j) allocate each producer's share of  
16 certain key customers' sales; and (k) restrict output.

17 139. The overall CRT conspiracy affected worldwide prices (including prices in the  
18 United States) that Defendants charged for CRT Products.

19 140. Agreements as to CRT Products were conducted through bilateral meetings as  
20 described above, through informal multilateral meetings as described above, and through more  
21 formal "Glass Meetings."

22 141. The "Glass Meetings" conducted with respect to CRT Products fell into several  
23 categories:

24 a. "Top Meetings" – meetings held by individuals at the highest level of the  
25 Defendant companies. These happened less frequently, typically on a quarterly basis, and were  
26 focused on longer term agreements and dispute resolution. Top Meetings occurred in South Korea,  
27 Taiwan, and China.

1           b.       “Management Meetings” – meetings held by high-level sales executives.  
2 These meetings occurred more frequently, typically on a monthly basis, and handled  
3 implementation of agreements made at “Top Meetings.” Management level meetings occurred in  
4 South Korea, Taiwan, China, Indonesia, Japan, and Thailand.

5           c.       “Working Level Meetings” – meetings of lower level sale and marketing  
6 employees to exchange data and discuss pricing. Working level meetings occurred in South Korea,  
7 Taiwan, and China.

8           d.       “Green Meetings” – meetings on golf courses.

9       142.   Attending Defendants would often exchange competitively sensitive information  
10 prior to a Glass Meeting. This included information on inventories, production, sales and exports.  
11 For some such meetings, where information could not be gathered in advance of the meeting, it  
12 was brought to the meeting and shared.

13       143.   The meetings themselves followed a typical pattern. First, attending Defendants  
14 exchanged information regarding pricing subjects, such as pricing and anticipated future demand  
15 for the upcoming quarter. The chairman of these meetings, who was selected on a rotating basis  
16 from among the attending Defendants (although, with respect to meetings on CPT Products, one  
17 person typically served as chair after 2002), displayed this information on a whiteboard or  
18 projector. Each attending Defendant was given the opportunity to update the information it had  
19 previously provided. Attending Defendants often computed overall production for each product  
20 and compared that to estimated demand.

21       144.   Based on this information, Defendants agreed on price guidelines, either a range of  
22 price increases or a range of price floors (known as “bottom prices”). The price guideline could  
23 serve as a floor in declining markets or could serve as a basis for a price increases in rising  
24 markets. Failure to object indicated assent. The agreements encompassed prices in United States  
25 dollars to specific third party customers, and prices reflecting inclusion of specific features in a  
26 CRT (such as certain types of coating or the differing types of shadow mask). The agreements  
27 encompassed not only prices charged to third party customers, but, in the case of vertically  
28 integrated manufacturers who produced both CRTs and CRT Products, also encompassed: (a)

1 prices charged by the CRT manufacturing arm of each such integrated company to the corporate  
2 division or subsidiary that manufactured or sold computer monitors, televisions or other similar  
3 products and (b) price floors on quotations offered by the competitors of the integrated company  
4 to such a division or subsidiary. Defendants also considered the internal pricing of products  
5 containing CRTs in agreeing upon the prices at which CRTs were set.

6 145. In addition to agreements about price, Defendants at Glass Meetings often also  
7 made agreements related to both overall market share and the share of a particular customer's  
8 purchases. As part of the latter type of agreement, respective Defendants were designated as the  
9 "major supplier" to certain customers. This designation was based on the historical relationships  
10 that were already in place between the suppliers and customers.

11 146. In addition to agreements on market shares, the Defendants often also agreed and  
12 implemented coordinated output restrictions. These output agreements began as agreements to  
13 shut down production lines for a certain number of days. As time went on, they changed to  
14 agreements to shut down entire production lines. To police this aspect of the conspiracy, there  
15 were in-person follow-up audits, in which a designated co-conspirator would visit the facilities of  
16 another co-conspirator in order to ensure that output restrictions were being implemented.  
17 Sometimes, they also discussed plans related to future capacity expansion. Defendants based  
18 these determinations on what the market would look like, after jointly analyzing anticipated  
19 supply and demand. The analysis often included consideration of downstream prices for  
20 televisions, computer monitors, or similar products and how they would affect the price ranges  
21 being collusively set.

22 147. Each attending Defendant at Glass Meetings gave a report with price and projected  
23 future output. The information reported included new capacity, new product lines, and other  
24 relevant information. Each of the other attending Defendants then had the opportunity to  
25 challenge the presenter on information being presenting, thus reflecting monitoring of the  
26 conspiracy.

27 148. Defendants would also agree on what to say about price changes or output  
28 restrictions to their customers in order to conceal their conspiracy. Often, one co-conspirator was

1 chosen to make the first price announcement, with the others following on an agreed-upon  
2 schedule.

3 149. Finally, the attending Defendants would organize the next upcoming meeting.

4 150. During the course of these meetings, attending Defendants would be assigned the  
5 task of contacting non-attendees in order to secure their consent to the agreements reached.

6 151. In contrast to Top or Management Meetings, Working Level Meetings were  
7 attended by more junior level executives or sales employees and regional level managers. At these  
8 meetings, attending Defendants exchanged sales, shipment, and price information. The meetings  
9 also included agreements on pricing. The Working Level Meetings occurred at various locations,  
10 including Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, Taiwan, South Korea, Singapore, Europe, and China.

11 152. The attending Defendants at these meetings also often agreed to follow up with  
12 non-attending Defendants in order to communicate the agreements reached at these meetings and  
13 secure adherence to them. These efforts were successful.

14 153. Agreements at these meetings were also reached to: (a) coordinate in giving  
15 customers pretextual reasons for the implementation of the price guidelines agreed upon, (b)  
16 expose and eliminate any cheating on the agreements reached, and (c) with respect to CPT  
17 Products, coordinate pricing and supply by CPT producers located in India, Europe, and Brazil.

18 **E. Summary of Specific Defendant Participation In Unlawful Meetings And Agreements**

19 154. When Plaintiffs refer to a corporate family or companies by a single name in their  
20 allegations of participation in the conspiracy, it is to be understood that the Plaintiffs are alleging  
21 that one or more employees or agents of entities within the corporate family engaged in  
22 conspiratorial meetings on behalf of every company in that family. In fact, the individual  
23 participants in the conspiratorial meetings and discussions did not always know the corporate  
24 affiliation of their counterparts, nor did they distinguish between the entities within a corporate  
25 family. The individual participants entered into agreements on behalf of, and reported these  
26 meetings and discussions to, their respective corporate families. As a result, the entire corporate  
27 family was represented in meetings and discussions by their agents and was a party to the  
28 agreements reached in them. For the various meeting participants identified below, in many



1 instances, their high-ranking executives participated in a significant number of the meetings  
2 described.

3 155. Chunghwa, through Chunghwa PT and Chunghwa Malaysia, participated in  
4 hundreds of illegal bilateral and group meetings from 1995 to 2007 in which unlawful agreements  
5 as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and market allocation of CRT Products  
6 occurred. These included hundreds of bilateral meetings and hundreds of group meetings of all the  
7 types described herein that took place in Southeast Asia, China, Europe and Scotland. The  
8 representatives of Chunghwa who participated in some of these meetings included its highest  
9 executives, such as the former Chairman and CEO of Chunghwa PT, C.Y. Lin.

10 156. Daewoo International, either directly or through Daewoo Electronics or Orion,  
11 participated in multiple illegal bilateral and at least several dozen group meetings from 1996 to  
12 2004 in which unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and  
13 market allocation of CRT Products occurred. These meetings occurred in China, South Korea,  
14 Malaysia, Taiwan, Thailand, and the U.K. Daewoo never effectively withdrew from this  
15 conspiracy.

16 157. Hitachi, through Hitachi Ltd., Hitachi Shenzhen, Hitachi Displays, and Hitachi  
17 Asia, participated in over a dozen illegal bilateral and group meetings from 1996 through at least  
18 2001 in which unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and  
19 market allocation of CRT Products occurred. These included more than ten bilateral meetings and  
20 more than five group meetings of the types described herein, which took place in Taiwan and  
21 China. Hitachi never effectively withdrew from this conspiracy.

22 158. Hitachi America and HEDUS were represented at those meetings and were parties  
23 to the agreements entered at them. Further to the extent Hitachi America and HEDUS distributed  
24 CRT Products to direct purchasers, they played a significant role in the conspiracy because  
25 Defendants wished to ensure that the prices for such products paid by direct purchasers would not  
26 undercut the pricing agreements reached at these various meetings. Thus, Hitachi America and  
27 HEDUS were active, knowing participants in this conspiracy.

28 159. Irico, through IGC, IGE, and IDDC, participated in multiple illegal bilateral and at

1 least several dozen illegal group meetings from 1998 to 2006 in which unlawful agreements as to,  
2 *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and market allocation of CRT Products  
3 occurred. These meetings took place in China. Irico never effectively withdrew from this  
4 conspiracy. None of Irico's conspiratorial conduct in connection with CRT Products was  
5 mandated by the Chinese government; Irico was acting to further its independent private interests  
6 in participating in this conspiracy.

7 160. LG Electronics participated, through LGPD, LP Displays, LGEI, and LGETT, in  
8 more than a dozen illegal bilateral and more than a hundred illegal group meetings from 1995 to  
9 2006 in which unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and  
10 market allocation of CRT Products occurred. These meetings took place in Taiwan, South Korea,  
11 Indonesia, Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia, and China. LG Electronics never effectively withdrew  
12 from this conspiracy.

13 161. LGEUSA was represented at these meetings and was a party to the agreements  
14 entered at them. To the extent LGEUSA distributed CRT Products to direct purchasers, it played  
15 a significant role in the conspiracy because Defendants wished to ensure that the prices for such  
16 products paid by direct purchasers would not undercut the pricing agreements reached at these  
17 various meetings. Thus, LGEUSA was an active, knowing participant in this conspiracy.

18 162. Panasonic, directly or through Matsushita Malaysia, participated in several dozen  
19 illegal bilateral and group meetings from 1996 through at least 2003 in which unlawful  
20 agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and market allocation of CRT  
21 Products occurred. These included bilateral meetings and group meetings of the types described  
22 herein. These meetings took place in Taiwan, Malaysia, and China. Panasonic never effectively  
23 withdrew from this conspiracy.

24 163. PCNA and PACEC were represented at those meetings and was a party to the  
25 agreements entered at them. To the extent PCNA and PACEC distributed CRT Products to direct  
26 purchasers, it played a significant role in the conspiracy because Defendants wished to ensure that  
27 the prices for such products paid by direct purchasers would not undercut the pricing agreements  
28 reached at these various meetings. Thus, PCNA and PACEC were active, knowing participants in

1 the alleged conspiracy.

2 164. Philips, through Royal Philips, Philips Taiwan, PEIL, LGPD, and LP Displays,  
3 participated in over 100 illegal bilateral and group meetings from 1996 through 2007 in which  
4 unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and market  
5 allocation of CRT Products occurred. These included several bilateral meetings and over 100  
6 group meetings of the types described herein. These meetings occurred in Korea, Taiwan, China,  
7 Malaysia, Scotland, the U.K., and various locations in Europe. Philips participated through Royal  
8 Philips or its subsidiaries into 2001 and participated thereafter through LGPD. Philips never  
9 effectively withdrew from this conspiracy.

10 165. Philips America, Philips Brazil, and PCEC were represented at those meetings and  
11 were a party to the agreements entered at them. To the extent Philips America, Philips Brazil, and  
12 PCEC distributed CRT Products to direct purchasers, it played a significant role in the conspiracy  
13 because Defendants wished to ensure that the prices for such products paid by direct purchasers  
14 would not undercut the pricing agreements reached at these various meetings. Thus, Philips  
15 America, Philips Brazil, and PCEC were active, knowing participants in this conspiracy.

16 166. Samsung, through SEC, Samsung SDI, Samsung Malaysia, Samsung SDI  
17 Shenzhen, and Samsung SDI Tianjin, participated in hundreds of illegal bilateral and illegal group  
18 meetings from 1995 through at least 2006 in which unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price,  
19 output restrictions, and customer and market allocation of CRT Products (including CDT Products  
20 and CPT Products) occurred. These included dozens of bilateral meetings and several hundred  
21 group meetings of the types described herein. These meetings occurred in South Korea, Taiwan,  
22 China, Malaysia, Japan, Singapore, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and various locations in  
23 Europe. Samsung never effectively withdrew from this conspiracy.

24 167. Samsung America, SEAI, Samsung SDI Brazil, and Samsung SDI Mexico were  
25 represented at those meetings and were a party to the agreements entered at them. To the extent  
26 Samsung America, SEAI and Samsung SDI Mexico distributed CRT Products to direct  
27 purchasers, they played a significant role in the conspiracy because Defendants wished to ensure  
28 that the prices for such products paid by direct purchasers would not undercut the pricing

1 agreements reached at these various meetings. Thus, Samsung America, SEAI, and Samsung SDI  
2 Mexico were active, knowing participants in this conspiracy.

3 168. Samtel participated in multiple illegal bilateral meetings between 1998 and 2006 in  
4 which unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and market  
5 allocation of CPT Products occurred. These meetings occurred in Malaysia. Samtel never  
6 effectively withdrew from this conspiracy.

7 169. To the extent Tatung America distributed CRT Products to direct purchasers, it  
8 played a significant role in the conspiracy because Defendants wished to ensure that the prices for  
9 such products paid by direct purchasers would not undercut the pricing agreements reached at  
10 these various meetings. Thus, Tatung America was an active, knowing participant in the alleged  
11 conspiracy.

12 170. Thai CRT participated in over 50 illegal bilateral and group meetings between 1998  
13 and 2006 in which unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer  
14 and market allocation of CPT Products occurred. These meetings occurred in Taiwan, South  
15 Korea, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, and China. Thai CRT never effectively  
16 withdrew from this conspiracy.

17 171. Toshiba, through TC and TDDT, participated in over 50 illegal bilateral and group  
18 meetings between 1995 and 2003 in which unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output  
19 restrictions, and customer and market allocation of CRT Products occurred. These meetings  
20 occurred in Taiwan, Thailand, and Indonesia. Toshiba never effectively withdrew from this  
21 conspiracy.

22 172. Toshiba America, TAIP, TACP, TACPI, and TAEP were represented at those  
23 meetings and were a party to the agreements entered at them. To the extent Toshiba America,  
24 TAIP, TACP, and TAEP distributed CRT Products to direct purchasers, they played a significant  
25 role in the conspiracy because Defendants wished to ensure that the prices for such products paid  
26 by direct purchasers would not undercut the pricing agreements reached at these various meetings.  
27 Thus, Toshiba America, TAIP, TACP, and TAEP were active, knowing participants in this  
28 conspiracy.

1 173. BMCC participated in at over 20 illegal bilateral group meetings between 1998 and  
2 2001 in which unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and  
3 market allocation of CRT Products (including CDT Products and CPT Products) occurred. These  
4 meetings occurred in China. BMCC never effectively withdrew from this conspiracy. None of  
5 BMCC's conspiratorial conduct in connection with CRT Products was mandated by the Chinese  
6 government; BMCC was acting to further its independent private interests in participating in this  
7 conspiracy.

8 174. MTPD participated in at several dozen illegal bilateral and group meetings between  
9 1998 and 2001 in which unlawful agreements as to, *inter alia*, price, output restrictions, and  
10 customer and market allocation of CPT Products occurred. These meetings occurred in Malaysia,  
11 Thailand, Singapore, Taiwan, and Indonesia. MTPD never effectively withdrew from this  
12 conspiracy.

13 175. LP Display and its predecessor entity LGPD participated in over 100 illegal  
14 bilateral and group meetings between 2001 and 2006 in which unlawful agreements as to, *inter*  
15 *alia*, price, output restrictions, and customer and market allocation of CRT Products (including  
16 CDT Products and CPT Products) occurred. These meetings occurred in Taiwan, South Korea,  
17 Japan, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, Indonesia, and China. Neither LP Display nor LGPD ever  
18 effectively withdrew from this conspiracy.

19 **F. Use of Trade Associations And Trade Events To Facilitate The Conspiracy**

20 176. Defendants' collusive activities have been furthered by trade associations and trade  
21 events that provided opportunities to conspire and share information. One example is the Korea  
22 Display Conference ("KDC"), hosted by DisplayBank and, since the summer of 2004, by  
23 KODEMIA, the Korean Display Equipment Material Industry Association. KODEMIA is a  
24 national trade organization representing about 80 member companies in the Korean display  
25 industry, including manufacturers and suppliers. Prior to the summer of 2004, the KDC had been  
26 hosted by EDIRAK, the Electronic Display Industrial Research Association of Korea. EDIRAK  
27 had a stated goal of "promoting co-activity with foreign Organizations related to display  
28 industries." Since 1996, EDIRAK had a cooperation pact with the United States Display



1 Consortium ("USDC"). In describing that pact, Malcolm Thompson, then the Chairman of  
2 USDC's governing board, said "[e]ven competitors should cooperate on common issues."

3 177. Samsung and LG Electronics were members of both KODEMIA and EDIRAK, and  
4 have participated extensively in the KDCs.

5 178. The KDC has taken place in Seoul, Korea or other Korean venues on: December 4,  
6 2002; June 12, 2003; December 9-10, 2003; June 9-10, 2004; November 23-24, 2004; November  
7 3-4, 2005; July 6-7, 2006; and June 26-27, 2007. Top executives of Samsung's and LG  
8 Electronics' CRT operations have participated at these events, including H.K. Chung, Woo Jong  
9 Lee, Bae Choel-Han, Jung Ho-Gyun and H.C. Kim of Samsung and S.T. Kim, S. Trinker and Ney  
10 Corsino of LG Electronics. Executives of foreign companies also participated, such as Zenzou  
11 Tashima of Hitachi.

12 179. Other opportunities to collude among the Defendants were provided by events  
13 sponsored by the Society for Information Display, such as the annual Asian Symposiums on  
14 Information Display, the annual International Display Manufacturing Conference and Exhibition  
15 (the most recent one of which was held in Taipei, Taiwan), the annual International Meeting on  
16 Information Displays (held each August in Daegu, Korea) and the annual International Display  
17 Workshops (the most recent ones of which have been held in Japan).

18 180. Through these trade association and trade events, and in meetings related to these  
19 trade associations and trade events, on information and belief, Defendants shared what would  
20 normally be considered proprietary and competitively sensitive information. This exchange of  
21 information was used to implement and monitor the conspiracy.

## 22 **G. Effects of Defendants' Antitrust Violations**

### 23 **1. Examples of Reductions in Manufacturing Capacity by Defendants**

24 181. As explained above, during the Class Period, the Defendants consolidated their  
25 manufacturing facilities in lower-cost venues such as China and reduced manufacturing capacity  
26 to prop up prices.

27 182. On July 15, 2003, Mitsubishi Electric closed a CRT plant in northern Mexico, just  
28 five years after the plant was opened. The plant's closure resulted in a loss of capacity to

1 manufacture 2.7 million CRTs a year for 17-inch computer monitors. This was one of the  
2 principal applications for CRTs during this time period.

3 183. In December of 2004, MTPD closed its American subsidiary's operations in  
4 Horeseheads, New York citing price and market erosion. Panasonic announced that the closing  
5 was part of the company's "global restructuring initiatives in the CRT business." The company  
6 further stated that in the future, "CRTs for the North American market will be supplied by other  
7 manufacturing locations in order to establish an optimum CRT manufacturing structure."

8 184. In July of 2005, LGPD ceased CRT production at its Durham, England facility,  
9 citing a shift in demand from Europe to Asia.

10 185. In December of 2005, MTPD announced that it would close its American  
11 subsidiary's operations in Ohio, as well as operations in Germany, by early 2006. Like LG  
12 Philips, the company explained that it was shifting its CRT operations to Asian and Chinese  
13 markets.

14 186. In late 2005, Samsung SDI followed the lead of other manufacturers, closing its  
15 CRT factory in Germany.

16 187. In July of 2006, Orion America shut down a CRT manufacturing plant in Princeton,  
17 Indiana. The same month, Panasonic announced it was shutting down its CRT factory in Malaysia  
18 and liquidating its joint venture with Toshiba.

## 19 **2. Examples of Collusive Pricing for CRT Products**

20 188. Defendants' collusion is evidenced by unusual price movements in the CRT market.  
21 In the 1990s, industry analysts repeatedly predicted declines in consumer prices for CRTs that did  
22 not fully materialize. For example, in 1992, an analyst for Market Intelligent Research  
23 Corporation predicted that "[e]conomies of scale, in conjunction with technological improvements  
24 and advances in manufacturing techniques, will produce a drop in the price of the average  
25 electronic display to about \$50 in 1997." Despite such predictions, and the existence of economic  
26 conditions warranting a drop in prices, CRT prices nonetheless remained stable.

27 189. In 1996, another industry source noted that "the price of the 14" tube is at a  
28 sustainable USD50 and has been for some years . . . ."

190. In reality, consumer prices for CRT Products never approached \$50 in 1997, and were consistently more than double this price.

191. Despite the ever-increasing popularity of, and intensifying competition from, flat panel monitors, prices for CRT monitors were "stuck stubbornly at high price levels" throughout 1995 according to a *CNET News.com* article. This price stabilization was purportedly due exclusively to a shortage of critical components such as glass. This was a pretext used to conceal the conspiracy.

192. Prices for CRT monitors did fall sharply as a result of the Asian economic crisis of 1998, which severely devalued Asian currencies. This prompted the keynote speaker at Asia Display 1998, an annual conference for the display industry, to state:

We believe that now is the time to revise our strategic plan in order to survive in this tough environment and also to prepare for the coming years. This means that we have to deviate from the traditional approach of the simple scale up of production volume.

193. In early 1999, despite declining production costs and the rapid entry of flat panel display products, the price of large-sized color CRTs actually rose. The price increase was allegedly based on increasing global demand for the products. In fact, this price rise was the result of collusive conduct amongst Defendants.

194. After experiencing an oversupply of 17-inch CRTs in the second half of 1999, the average selling price of CRTs rose again in early 2000. A March 13, 2000 article quoted an industry analyst as saying that this price increase was "unlike most other PC-related products."

195. On June 1, 2004, LG Electronics raised the prices of its 15-inch and 17-inch CRT monitors in India. This price hike was falsely attributed exclusively to a shortage of glass needed to manufacture CRTs.

196. Over the course of the conspiracy period, the price of CRTs remained stable, and in some instances went up in an unexplained manner, despite the natural trend in most technology products to go down over time. CRT technology was mature, and the costs of production were relatively low compared to other emerging technologies. As Finsen Yu, President of Skyworth Macao Commercial Off Shore Co., Ltd, a television maker, was quoted as saying in January of

1 2007, "[t]he CRT technology is very mature; prices and technology have become stable."

2 197. Indeed, CRT prices resisted downward price pressures and remained stable over a  
3 period of many years. Even in periods of decreasing prices caused by outside factors, such as the  
4 Asian currency crisis, the prices of CRT Products did not decline as much as they would have  
5 absent the conspiracy. The stability of the price of CRTs was accomplished by the collusive  
6 activities alleged above.

7 **H. Summary Of Effects Of The Conspiracy Involving CRT Products**

8 198. The above combination and conspiracy has had the following effects, among  
9 others:

10 a. Price competition in the sale of CRT Products by Defendants and their co-  
11 conspirators has been restrained, suppressed and eliminated throughout the United States;

12 b. Prices for CRT Products sold by Defendants has been raised, fixed,  
13 maintained and stabilized at artificially high and noncompetitive levels throughout the United  
14 States; and

15 c. Direct purchasers of CRT Products from Defendants have been deprived of  
16 the benefit of free and open competition in the purchase of CRT Products.

17 199. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiffs  
18 and other members of the class have been injured in their business and property in that they paid  
19 more for CRT Products than they otherwise would have paid in the absence of the unlawful  
20 conduct of Defendants.

21 **I. Fraudulent Concealment**

22 200. Plaintiffs had neither actual nor constructive knowledge of the facts constituting  
23 their claim for relief despite diligence in trying to discover the pertinent facts. Plaintiffs and  
24 members of the Class did not discover, and could not have discovered through the exercise of  
25 reasonable diligence, the existence of the conspiracy alleged herein until November of 2007, when  
26 the governmental investigations described above became public. Defendants engaged in a secret  
27 conspiracy that did not give rise to facts that would put Plaintiffs or the Class on inquiry notice  
28 that there was a conspiracy to fix prices for CRT Products.

1           201. Because the Defendants' agreement, understanding and conspiracy was kept secret,  
2 Plaintiffs and Class members were unaware of Defendants' unlawful conduct alleged herein and  
3 did not know that they were paying artificially high prices for CRT Products.

4           202. The affirmative acts of the Defendants alleged herein, including acts in furtherance  
5 of the conspiracy, were wrongfully concealed and carried out in a manner that precluded detection.  
6 As noted above, Defendants organized Glass Meetings to avoid detection, conducted bilateral  
7 meetings in secret and agreed at Glass Meetings to orchestrate the giving of pretextual reasons for  
8 their pricing actions and output restrictions. Defendants would coordinate and exchange in  
9 advance the texts of the proposed communications with customers containing these pretextual  
10 statements and would coordinate which co-conspirator would first communicate these pretextual  
11 statements to customers.

12           203. By its very nature, Defendants' price-fixing conspiracy was inherently self-  
13 concealing.

14           204. Plaintiffs and the Class members could not have discovered the alleged contract,  
15 conspiracy or combination at an earlier date by the exercise of reasonable diligence because of the  
16 deceptive practices and techniques of secrecy employed by Defendants and their co-conspirators  
17 to avoid detection of, and fraudulently conceal, their contract, conspiracy or combination. The  
18 contract, conspiracy or combination as herein alleged was fraudulently concealed by Defendants  
19 by various means and methods, including, but not limited to, secret meetings, surreptitious  
20 communications between the Defendants by the use of the telephone or in-person meetings in  
21 order to prevent the existence of written records, discussion on how to evade antitrust laws and  
22 concealing the existence and nature of their competitor pricing discussions from non-conspirators  
23 (including customers).

24           205. As alleged above, Defendants in mid-2000 began to hold CDT and CPT meetings  
25 at separate venues in order to avoid detection. Participants at Glass Meetings were also told not to  
26 take minutes. Attending companies also reduced the number of their respective attendees to  
27 maintain secrecy.

28           206. Defendants also agreed at Glass Meetings and bilateral meetings to give pretextual



1 reasons for price increases and output reductions to their customers.

2 207. As alleged above, in early 1999, despite declining production costs and the rapid  
3 entry of flat panel display products, the price of large-sized color CRTs actually rose. The price  
4 increase was allegedly based on increasing global demand for the products. In fact, this price rise  
5 was the result of collusive conduct amongst Defendants, which was undisclosed at the time.

6 208. As alleged above, despite increased competition from flat panel monitors, prices for  
7 CRT monitors were stuck stubbornly at high price levels throughout 2001. This price stabilization  
8 was purportedly due exclusively to a shortage of critical components such as glass. This was a  
9 pretext used to cover up the conspiracy.

10 209. In addition, when several CRT manufacturers, including Defendants Samsung,  
11 Philips, and LG Electronics, increased the price of CRT Products in 2004, the price hike was  
12 blamed on a shortage of glass shells use for manufacturing CRT monitors. In justifying this price  
13 increase, a Deputy General Manager for an LG Electronics distributor in India stated, "[t]his  
14 shortage [of glass shells] is a global phenomena and every company has to increase the prices of  
15 CRT monitors in due course of time."

16 210. Manufacturers such as LG Electronics periodically issued press statements falsely  
17 asserting that CRT prices were being driven lower by intense competition.

18 211. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants' purported  
19 reasons for the price increases of CRT Products were materially false and misleading and made for  
20 the purpose of concealing Defendants' anti-competitive scheme as alleged herein.

21 212. As a result of Defendants' fraudulent concealment of their conspiracy, the running  
22 of any statute of limitations has been tolled with respect to any claims that Plaintiffs and the Class  
23 members have as a result of the anticompetitive conduct alleged in this complaint.

#### 24 **VIII. CLAIM FOR VIOLATIONS OF 15 U.S.C. § 1**

25 213. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all the above allegations as if fully set forth  
26 herein.

27 214. From March 1, 1995, the exact date being unknown to Plaintiffs and exclusively  
28 within the knowledge of Defendants, Defendants and their co-conspirators entered into a

1 continuing contract, combination or conspiracy to unreasonably restrain trade and commerce in  
2 violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 1) by artificially reducing or eliminating  
3 competition in the United States.

4 215. In particular, Defendants have combined and conspired to raise, fix, maintain or  
5 stabilize the prices of CRT Products sold in the United States.

6 216. As part of and in furtherance of this conspiracy, Defendants or their agents engaged  
7 in various collusive practices with respect to CRT Products.

8 217. With respect to CRT Products, Defendants or their agents agreed, *inter alia*, to: (a)  
9 fix target prices and price guidelines; (b) exchange pertinent information on, *inter alia*, shipments,  
10 prices, production, and customer demand; (c) coordinate public statements regarding available  
11 capacity and supply; (d) resolve issues created by asymmetrical vertical integration among some  
12 of the co-conspirators; (e) keep their collusive meetings secret; (f) expose cheating on the  
13 agreements and to discuss the reconciliation of accounts; (g) allocate market share of overall sales;  
14 (g) influence and, at times, coordinate pricing with producers in other geographic markets; (h)  
15 limit competition for certain key customers; (i) allocate customers; (j) allocate each producer's  
16 share of certain key customers' sales; and (k) restrict output.

17 218. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, prices for CRT Products were raised,  
18 fixed, maintained and stabilized in the United States.

19 219. The contract, combination or conspiracy among Defendants consisted of a  
20 continuing agreement, understanding and concerted action among Defendants and their co-  
21 conspirators.

22 220. For purposes of formulating and effectuating their contract, combination or  
23 conspiracy, Defendants and their co-conspirators did those things they contracted, combined, or  
24 conspired to do, including:

25 a. Participating in meetings and conversations to discuss and agree upon the  
26 prices and supply of CRT Products;

27 b. Communicating in writing and orally to fix prices, allocate customers, and  
28 restrict output;

1 c. Agreeing to manipulate prices and supply of CRT Products sold in the  
2 United States, and to allocate customers of such products, in a manner that deprived direct  
3 purchasers of free and open competition;

4 d. Issuing price announcements and price quotations in accordance with the  
5 agreements reached;

6 e. Selling CRT Products to customers in the United States at non-competitive  
7 prices; and

8 f. Providing false statements to the public to explain increased prices for CRT  
9 Products.

10 221. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs and the other members of  
11 the Class have been injured in their businesses and property in that they have paid more for CRT  
12 Products than they otherwise would have paid in the absence of Defendants' unlawful conduct.

### 13 IX. DAMAGES

14 222. During the Class Period, Plaintiffs and the other members of the Class purchased  
15 CRT Products directly from Defendants, or their subsidiaries, agents, and/or affiliates, and, by  
16 reason of the antitrust violations herein alleged, paid more for such products than they would have  
17 paid in the absence of such antitrust violations. As a result, Plaintiffs and the other members of  
18 the Class have sustained damages to their business and property in an amount to be determined at  
19 trial.

### 20 X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that the Court enter judgment on its behalf and on behalf of  
22 the Class herein, adjudging and decreeing that:

23 A. This action may proceed as a class action, with Plaintiffs as the designated Class  
24 representatives and its counsel as Class Counsel;

25 B. Defendants have engaged in a contract, combination, and conspiracy in violation of  
26 Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 1), and that Plaintiffs and the members of the Class  
27 have been injured in their business and property as a result of Defendants' violations;

28 C. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class recover damages sustained by them, as

1 provided by the federal antitrust laws, and that a joint and several judgment in favor of Plaintiffs  
2 and the Class be entered against the Defendants in an amount to be trebled in accordance with  
3 such laws;

4 D. Defendants, their subsidiaries, affiliates, successors, transferees, assignees and the  
5 respective officers, directors, partners, agents, and employees thereof and all other persons acting  
6 or claiming to act on their behalf be permanently enjoined and restrained from continuing and  
7 maintaining the combination, conspiracy, or agreement alleged herein;

8 E. Plaintiffs and members of the Class be awarded pre-judgment and post-judgment  
9 interest, and that such interest be awarded at the highest legal rate from and after the date of  
10 service of the initial complaint in this action;

11 F. Plaintiffs and members of the Class recover their costs of this suit, including  
12 reasonable attorneys' fees as provided by law; and

13 G. Plaintiffs and members of the Class receive such other or further relief as may be  
14 just and proper.

#### 15 **XI. JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

16 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury of all  
17 of the claims asserted in this Complaint so triable.

18  
19 DATED: March 16, 2009 By: /s/ Guido Saveri  
20 Guido Saveri  
21 R. Alexander Saveri  
22 Geoffrey C. Rushing  
23 Cadio Zirpoli  
24 Gianna Gruenwald  
25 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.  
26 706 Sansome Street  
27 San Francisco, California 94111  
28 Telephone: (415) 217-6810

*Interim Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Bruce L. Simon  
Jonathan Watkins  
Esther L Klisura  
PEARSON, SIMON, WARSHAW & PENNY, LLP  
44 Montgomery Street , Suite 1430  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 433-9000

Michael P. Lehmann  
HAUSFELD LLP  
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 633-1908

H. Laddie Montague, Jr.  
Ruthanne Gordon  
Candice Enders  
BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.  
1622 Locust Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 875-3000

Joseph J. Tabacco, Jr.  
Christopher T. Heffelfinger  
BERMAN DEVALERIO PEASE & TABACCO, P.C.  
425 California Street, Suite 2025  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 433-3200

Anthony J. Bolognese  
Joshua H. Grabar  
BOLOGNESE & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
1500 JFK Boulevard  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
Telephone: (215) 814-6751

Bryan L. Clobes  
Ellen Meriwether  
CAFFERTY FAUCHER LLP  
1717 Arch Street, Suite 3610  
Philidelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 864-2800

Charles H. Johnson  
CHARLES H. JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES PA  
2599 Mississippi Street  
New Brighton, MN 55113  
Telephone: (651) 633-5685



Joseph W. Cotchett  
Steven N. Williams  
Aron K. Liang  
COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY  
San Francisco Airport Office Center  
840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200  
Burlingame, CA 94010  
Telephone: (650) 697-6000

Roger M. Schrimp  
Betty L. Julian  
Fred A. Silva  
Kathy L. Monday  
DAMRELL NELSON SCHRIMP  
PALLIOS PACHER & SILVA  
1601 I St, 5th Floor  
Modesto, CA 95354  
Telephone: (209) 526-3500

John G. Emerson  
Scott E. Poynter  
EMERSON POYNTER LLP  
The Museum Center  
500 President Clinton Ave., Suite 305  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Telephone: (501) 907-2555

Roberta Liebenberg  
FINE, KAPLAN AND BLACK, R.P.C.  
1835 Market Street, 28th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 567-6565

Steven A. Kanner  
William London  
Douglas A. Millen  
FREED KANNER LONDON & MILLEN LLC  
2201 Waukegan Road, Suite 130  
Bannockburn, IL 60015  
Telephone: (224) 632-4500

Joseph Goldberg  
FREEDMAN BOYD HOLLANDER GOLDBERG & IVES,  
PA  
20 First Plaza, Suite 700  
Albuquerque, NM 87102  
Telephone: (505) 346-2222

Robert J. Gralewski, Jr.  
GERGOSIAN & GRALEWSKI LLP  
655 West Broadway, Suite 1410  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 237-9500

1 Marc Jeffrey Greenspon  
2 LAW OFFICES OF MARC J. GREENSPON  
3 6200 Spring Isles Blvd.  
4 Lake Worth, FL 33463  
5 Telephone: (954) 817-6272

6 Martin E. Grossman  
7 LAW OFFICES OF MARTIN E. GROSSMAN  
8 2121 Green Brier Drive  
9 Villanova, PA 19085  
10 Telephone: (610) 527-3277

11 Daniel E. Gustafson  
12 Jason S. Kilene  
13 Sung Yun K. Smith  
14 GUSTAFSON GLUEK PLLC  
15 650 Northstar East  
16 608 Second Avenue South  
17 Minneapolis, MN 55402  
18 Telephone: (612) 333-8844

19 Randy R. Renick  
20 HADSELL STORMER KEENY RICHARDSON &  
21 RENICK  
22 128 North Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 204  
23 Pasadena, CA 91103  
24 Telephone: (626) 585-9600

25 Anthony D. Shapiro  
26 Ronnie Seidel Spiegel  
27 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO  
28 1301 5th Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Telephone: (206) 623-7292

Vincent J Esades  
Renae D. Steiner  
HEINS MILLS & OLSON, PLC  
310 Clifton Ave  
Minneapolis, MN 55403  
Telephone: (612) 338-4605

Michael Stoker  
JOHNS FLAHERTY & COLLINS S.C.  
Exchange Building, Suite 600  
205 Fifth Avenue South  
P.O. Box 1626  
LaCrosse, WI 54602  
Telephone: (608) 784-5678

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Robert N. Kaplan  
Linda P. Nussbaum  
Gregory K. Arenson  
KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP  
850 Third Avenue, 14th Floor  
New York, NY 10022  
Telephone: (212) 687-1980

Steven F. Benz  
William J. Conyngham  
Andrew C. Shen  
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD & EVANS,  
P.L.L.C.  
1615 K Street NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-3209  
Telephone: (202) 326-7900

Richard M. Heimann  
Joseph R. Saveri  
Eric B. Fastiff  
LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP  
275 Battery Street, 30th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 956-1000

W. Joseph Bruckner  
Elizabeth R. Odette  
LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN PLLP  
100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  
Telephone (612) 339-6900

Joel Cary Meredith  
Steven J. Greenfogel  
Daniel Bruce Allanoff  
MEREDITH COHEN GREENFOGEL & SKIRNICK, P.C.  
1521 Locust Street, 8th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
Telephone: (215) 564-5182

Harry Shulman  
THE MILLS LAW FIRM  
145 Marina Boulevard  
San Rafael, CA 94901  
Telephone: (415) 445-1326

Brian D. Brooks  
MURRAY FRANK & SAILER LLP  
275 Madison Avenue Suite 801  
New York, NY 10016  
Telephone: (212) 682-1818  
Facsimile: (212) 682-1892

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Neal A Eisenbraun  
NEAL A. EIESENBRAUN, CHARTERED  
2599 Mississippi Street, Suite 201  
New Brighton, MN 55113  
Telephone: (651) 633-5685

Richard J. Arsenault  
NEBLETT BEARD & ARSENAULT  
2220 Bonaventure Court  
PO Box 1190  
Alexandria, LA 71309  
Telephone: (800) 256-1050

Mark Reinhardt  
Garrett D. Blanchfield, Jr.  
REINHARDT WENDORF & BLANCHFIELD  
East 1250 First National Bank Building  
322 Minnesota Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101  
Telephone: (651) 287-2100

Dianne M. Nast  
RODANAST, PC  
801 Estelle Drive  
Lancaster, PA 17601  
Telephone: (717) 892-3000

Michael D. Shaffer  
SHAFFER & GAIER, LLC  
One Penn Center  
1617 JFK Boulevard, Suite 946  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 741-0100

Natalie Finkelman-Bennett  
Jayne Goldstein  
SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & SHAH, LLC  
35 East State Street  
Media, PA 19063  
Telephone: (610) 891-9880

Daniel D. Owen  
P. John Brady  
POL SINELLI SHUGHART, P.C.  
Twelve Wyandotte Plaza, Suite 1600  
120 W. 12th Street  
Kansas City, MO 64105  
Telephone: (816) 395-0671

Eugene A. Spector  
William G. Caldes  
SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF PC  
1818 Market Street, 25th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 496-0300

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Paul E. Slater  
SPERLING & SLATER  
55 West Monroe Street, Suite 3200  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Telephone: (312) 641-6492

Allan Steyer  
STEYER LOWENTHAL BOODROOKAS ALVAREZ &  
SMITH LLP  
One California Street, Third Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 421-3400

Lisa J. Rodriguez  
TRUJILLO, RODRIGUEZ & RICHARDS, LLP  
8 Kings Highway West  
Haddonfield, NJ 08033  
Telephone: (856) 795-9002

Joseph M. Vanek  
David P. Germaine  
VANEK VICKERS MASINI, P.C.  
111 S. Wacker, Suite 4050  
Suite 4050  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 224-1500

Kenneth A. Wexler  
WEXLER TORISEVA WALLACE LLP  
One North LaSalle Street Suite 2000  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Telephone: (312) 346-2222

Mary Jane Fait  
WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ  
LLC  
55 W. Monroe Street, Suite 1111  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Telephone: (312) 984-0000

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

crt.122